

JUL 29 2008

The Farmington Municipal School District

The Farmington Municipal School District No. 5 is the sixth largest district in the State with an enrollment of 10250 students. There are 10 elementary schools, 4 middle schools, an alternative junior-senior high school, two senior high schools and two pre-schools within the District. The District's educational program also includes vocational, technical and occupational training. The District provides education services for the detainees of the County Juvenile Detention Center, which averages approximately 20 students.

The District employs 35 administrators, approximately 747 teachers and other professional instructional personnel, 68 student services staff such as counselors, nurses, librarians, etc, and 256 support and administrative staff, maintenance, custodial and bus drivers

Currently, the District operates and maintains a variety of facilities in meeting its obligations to provide an education program for the school-age children residing within its boundaries. The District operates 19 school sites. The capacity of the school facilities is estimated at 10,000 students (FTE basis).

In addition to the school buildings and their contents, the District owns 290 acres of land upon which school buildings and facilities are located, approximately 579 acres of additional vacant property, the District Administration Building, a maintenance shop and custodial center, bus terminal, an Exceptional Program and Bilingual Education building, an instructional materials warehouse and 40 vehicles. The District owns its bus fleet (67). The District also owns 18-acre feet of water rights.

New Funding Formula Legislation

Farmington Municipal Schools is requesting the passage of legislation implementing the funding formula proposed by the Funding Formula Task Force. Sufficient funding is necessary for our district to meet the educational needs of all students.

Programs and Services:

1. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula affect your district's program cost?
An increase of approximately \$10,000,000.
2. How will the implementation of the proposed funding formula impact the educational programs and student services provided by your district?
 - a) Educational Programs: Farmington currently provides four class size reduction teachers out of Title II funds. The focus of Title II has changed over the past few years to recruiting and training of highly qualified staff. The district would fund those four teachers to allow the more appropriate use of Title II funds for district professional development, mentoring and assuring the hiring of highly qualified staff.

The district would ensure that grades 3-5 classroom have less than 24 students per class. This would require approximately 15 additional elementary teachers.

Intervention Specialists such as content coaches and facilitators have been identified as a need in the district to provide support to teachers. The need would be 2 core content coaches at each of the 10 elementary schools, 2 at each of the 4 middle schools and 2 at the high school level.

b) Student Services: Farmington has struggled to be able to afford full time counselors at our elementary schools. Only this year was the district able to fund a counselor at every elementary. There is a great need for a social worker at 5 of the district's lowest income elementary schools.

Each of our 2 major high schools is in need of a career counselor. Both high schools are implementing the High Schools that Work model and a ninth grade academy. Both of these will benefit from the services of a career counselor to ensure student success.

The district would add additional school nurses. Currently nurses serve several elementary schools.

Five certified librarians would be hired to serve two elementary schools each. We currently staff elementary libraries with library aides.

Two additional custodians would be added to bring the number of custodians required for the square footage in the district.

3. Will your district use the additional funding resulting from the implementation of the proposed funding formula to reduce class size? If so, what grades, and how many classrooms would be affected?

As indicated in #2 the district would move 4 class size reduction teachers from Title II funds into district operational funds and hire 15 additional elementary teachers grades 3-5 to ensure classes smaller than 24.

4. What other changes might your district consider as a result of additional funding?

5 elementary schools could be over 500 students in 08-09. The additional funding would allow the district to hire assistant principals at those elementary schools. Currently none of the districts' 10 elementary schools have assistant principals.

Bilingual, Special Education and Gifted programs need additional staff to provide more than adequate programs. The district would provide additional staff trainings as well as supplies and materials for the programs.

The district would be able to continue looking at operational funds as a means of ensuring we have the 42% match for PSCOC funding for our building improvements.

Additional funding will enable the district to add the four additional days for students and the extra professional development days.

5. How will your district ensure that it provides all of the following educational programs and services as required in the funding formula bill, as amended, during the session?

- bilingual and multicultural education, including culturally relevant learning environments, educational opportunities, and culturally relevant instructional materials;
- health and wellness, including physical education, athletics, nutrition, and health education;
- career-technical education;
- visual and performing arts and music;
- gifted education, advanced placement, and honors programs;
- special education; and
- distance education.

As in #4, additional staff, supplies and materials and professional development would be provided for support programs. The district would like to be able to offer incentives to hard to find bilingual and special education teachers to aid in recruitment.

For those elementary schools with over 500 students another physical education teacher could be hired to provide adequate physical education as well as health education.

We currently have an art teacher for every 2 elementary schools. There is a need to provide each elementary with a full time art teacher.

Career and technical education courses can be expensive. The district currently offers auto, welding and culinary arts in the Career and Technical Education center (CATE). Additional funding would assist the district in offering additional courses at the CATE center.

The CATE center is also available for distance learning classes which could be funded with additional resources.

6. To the best of your ability at this time, please fill in the table below to identify the additional state-funded FTE that your district would be able to provide as a result of the implementation of the proposed funding formula:

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Teachers	20			236	256
Principals	5			27	32
Counselors			2	26	28
Nurses	3			10	12
Physical Education Teachers	5			25	30
Art and Music Teachers	5			30	35
Social Workers	5			2	7
Librarians	5			6	11
Advanced Placement Teachers					

Personnel	Elementary	Middle	High	Current FTE	Proposed FTE
Gifted Education	5	2	2	12	21
Intervention Specialists	18	8	2	4	32
Bilingual Education					
Educational Assistants					
Special Education Teachers (excluding gifted)					
Ancillary and Support Staff					
Maintenance and Operations Staff (including custodians)			2	90	92
Data Entry Clerks	5			5	10
Other Central Office Staff					
Other School-based Staff					

Accountability:

The legislation introduced during the 2008 session to change the public school funding formula utilizes the Educational Plan for Student Success (EPSS) as the means of ensuring accountability with regard to districts providing a sufficient educational program for all students that includes not only the basic required academic programs, such as reading, writing, and math, but also programs such as bilingual-multicultural education, physical education, arts and music, and gifted programs. In short, PED is required to disapprove any budget for a district or charter school that cannot show in its EPSS that it is offering all required programs.

7. Do you believe that the EPSS is the appropriate mechanism to tie together budget approval and program delivery? If not, what means would you suggest be used as an alternative to ensure accountability?

The district and individual building EPSS is not only appropriate but a clear, concise way to ensure accountability. Having to review on a quarterly basis ensures data is being used for decision making and strategies incorporated allow for researched based training and best practices being shared. The EPSS process includes all the areas that budget is needed and an integral part of the plan.

Staff Salaries:

The proposed funding formula would replace the current Training and Experience (T&E) Index with the Index of Staff Qualifications (ISQ). Although both indexes are designed to distribute additional funding to districts and charter schools based on the composition of their instructional staff, they are not identical:

- The T&E calculation is based on years of service and academic degrees for all instructional staff but does not reflect the three-tiered licensure system for teachers.

- The ISQ calculation recognizes not only experience and academic degrees but also licensure levels. It was calibrated on the average teacher salaries for each of the three levels and distributes additional dollars based on the proportion of teachers in each of those levels. In addition, there is a second calculation for those instructional staff, such as counselors, who are not included in the three-tiered system. Because the base per-student cost upon which the proposed formula is based already reflects the average salary by personnel category in the average district, the ISQ is applied only to salary costs in a district or charter school that are beyond the average.

8. If you have calculated your district's ISQ using the most recent matrices in the bill (see Attachment 2), how would this factor impact funding for your district?

The new ISQ calculation would not result in increased funding for our district. The district's index would be 1.00.

Special Education:

9. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as in need of special education, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent? **(Do not include gifted students.)**

Number: 1300.50 Percentage: 12.77 %

10. How will the proposed funding formula's use of a fixed special education identification rate of 16 percent impact special education funding for your district?

Our district's percentage of identified special education students is below the national average; therefore we would not receive supplemental funding for students. However, being less than the 16% allows for more funding available in the base for the district to serve those identified students.

Gifted Education:

11. Currently, how many students in your district have been identified as gifted, and what percentage of your district's enrollment does this number represent?

Number: 461 Percentage: 4.53 %

12. Even though the bill as amended during the session does not require districts to consider students that have been identified as gifted to be in need of special education, it does require that these students be served. How will your district specifically address the needs of students identified as gifted?

Our district asks that each school submit a plan developed with the site council. The plan will include any proposals for additional resources needed. The district has not been able

to adequately fund the gifted program. With additional resources, the district would be able to support each school's effort to best serve gifted students.

Revenue Sources for Implementation:

13. What revenue sources for the additional dollars needed to reach sufficiency would your district support?

The district supports at least 50% of the general fund be allocated to education, that a set % of the interest from the permanent fund be used for education.

Potential Problems:

14. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise from the implementation of the proposed funding formula?

A problem we anticipate is the shortage of highly qualified teachers with a greater demand as districts are able to hire needed staff with the additional funding.

The implementation of the funding formula will require an education of our stakeholders regarding the formula.

15. What problems, if any, does your district anticipate will arise if the proposed funding formula is not implemented?

Our district will continue to struggle with not only being able to implement needed programs but looking at situations where programs are being cut.

Farmington has been diligent in maintaining a cash balance that has enabled us to implement mandates. However, each year a portion of that is used and the district's bond rating is at risk if we cannot maintain an adequate cash balance.

Class sizes will remain at the maximum allowed number of students which does not allow for the differentiated instruction that is needed to provide each student with the tools necessary to succeed.

Professional development of staff and implementation of programs necessary to provide interventions for students will be restricted and continue to be funded almost solely from supplemental funding (ie. Title I, Title II, etc.).

16. Please feel free to identify any other issues that have not been addressed in these questions that you feel the committee should be aware of.

The implementation of the proposed funding formula would allow the Farmington district to plan long term. Currently, we plan for the present with the funding we have because of the uncertainty of future funding.

In order for us to provide the education necessary for all students to be successful, we must be able to have the resources for hiring the necessary staff, providing the staff with the tools they need to be successful in their classrooms and to implement the programs needed to ensure student success. All of these require a long term commitment that we will only be able to make with the assurance of sufficient funding in the years to come.

PROPOSED PUBLIC SCHOOL FUNDING FORMULA: SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND CHARTER SCHOOLS

<i>Location: Roswell</i> May 12-14		<i>Location: Albuquerque</i> June 9-11		<i>Location: Kirtland</i> August 6		<i>Location: Raton</i> September 8-10		<i>Location: Deming</i> October 8-10		<i>Location: Santa Fe</i> November 19-21	
District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM	District	MEM
Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1		Group 1	
Artesia	3,548.5	Albuquerque	88,271.5	Central Consolidated	6,614.5	Las Vegas City	2,085.5	Alamogordo	6,321.0	Albuquerque	88,271.5
Clovis	8,035.0	Los Lunas	8,561.0	Farmington	10,189.5	Raton	1,360.5	Gadsden	13,955.5	Santa Fe	12,266.0
Hobbs	7,809.5	Rio Rancho	15,577.0	Gallup-McKinley	12,159.0	Taos	2,795.0	Las Cruces	23,559.5		
Lovington	3,084.0					West Las Vegas	1,703.5				
Portales	2,773.0										
Roswell	9,373.5										
Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2		Group 2	
Capitan	536.5	Belen	4,749.5	Aztec	3,064.5	Cimarron	450.0	Carlsbad	5,905.5	Española	4,309.0
Cloudcroft	461.0	Bernalillo	3,176.0	Bloomfield	3,096.5	Clayton	539.5	Cobre	1,396.5	Los Alamos	3,444.0
Dexter	1,097.0	Estancia	1,005.0	Grants-Cibola	3,698.0	Mora	567.5	Deming	5,418.0	Pojoaque	2,019.5
Eunice	570.5	Moriarty	3,590.5	Zuni	1,505.0	Questa	434.5	Hatch Valley	1,428.0	Ruidoso	2,273.5
Hagerman	448.0	Socorro	1,722.5					Silver Consolidated	3,091.5	Tucumcari	1,045.0
Jal	405.0							Truth or Consequences	1,392.0		
Loving	570.5										
Texico	526.0										
Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3		Group 3	
Carrizozo	215.5	Corona	84.5	Cuba	695.0	Des Moines	94.0	Animas	257.0	Chama	454.0
Dora	225.5	Jemez Valley	326.5	Dulce	691.0	Maxwell	102.0	Lordsburg	680.0	Jemez Mountain	343.0
Elida	120.5	Magdalena	428.5			Mosquero	38.0	Reserve	185.0	Logan	231.0
Floyd	243.5	Mountainair	339.0			Roy	79.0	Tularosa	959.0	Mesa Vista	437.0
Fort Sumner	304.5	Quemado	186.0			Springer	195.0			Pecos	714.0
Grady	121.5					Wagon Mound	148.5			Perlasco	547.5
Hondo Valley	121.5	Group 4								San Jon	149.5
House	107.0	Aldo Leopold, Silver City								Santa Rosa	654.0
Lake Arthur	148.0	Creative Ed. Prep. Inst. 1, Albuquerque								Vaughn	103.5
Melrose	208.5	Deming Cesar Chavez, Deming									
Tatum	292.5	Digital Arts & Tech. Acad., Albuquerque									
		El Camino Real, Albuquerque									
		Middle College High School, Gallup									
		Mosaic Academy, Aztec									
		Nuestros Valores, Albuquerque									
		Rio Gallinas School, West Las Vegas									
		Stanley Gutierrez Middle School, Roswell									
		SW Secondary Learning, Albuquerque									
		Taos Charter School, Taos									
		Turquoise Trail, Santa Fe									
		Walatowa, Jemez Pueblo									

NOTE: The district groupings are based on 2007-2008 40-day membership.

ATTACHMENT 2

ISQ-A – Teachers, Including Librarians

Level I																
Year's Within Level	0 – 1			2 – 3			4 – 5					Total	Total			
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE			
Bachelor's	57.71	0.64	36.93	38.71	0.67	25.94	23.58	0.71	16.74			120.00	79.61			
Master's	2.71	0.68	1.84	10.00	0.72	7.20	1.00	0.76	0.76			13.71	9.80			
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.71	0.00		0.75	0.00	1.00	0.79	0.79			1.00	0.79			
Total	60.42		38.78	48.71		33.14	25.58		18.29			134.71	90.20			
Level II																
Year's Within Level	4 – 6			7 – 8			9 – 15			Over 15					Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's	49.03	0.76	37.26	35.00	0.82	28.70	96.02	0.93	89.30	106.14	1.04	110.39			286.19	265.65
Master's	1.00	0.81	0.81	32.03	0.88	28.19	8.71	1.00	8.71	7.00	1.11	7.77			48.74	45.48
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	1.00	0.85	0.85		0.92	0.00		1.05	0.00	1.00	1.16	1.16			2.00	2.01
Total	51.03		38.92	67.03		56.89	104.73		98.01	114.14		119.32	336.93	313.13		
Level III																
Year's Within Level	7 – 8			9 – 15			Over 15					Total	Total			
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE			FTE	Adjusted FTE			
Bachelor's		0.90	0.00		1.02	0.00		1.17	0.00				0.00	0.00		
Master's	1.00	0.96	0.96	63.47	1.09	69.18	77.00	1.25	96.25				141.47	166.39		
Master's + 45/Post-Masters	1.00	1.01	1.01	2.00	1.14	2.28	19.00	1.31	24.89				22.00	28.18		
Total	2.00		1.97	65.47		71.46	96.00		121.14			163.47	194.57			
												Matrix Totals	635.11	597.91		

ISQ-B – Other Instructional Staff

Years of Experience	0 – 2			3 – 5			6 – 8			9 – 15			Over 15			Total	Total
Academic Classification	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Factor	Adjusted FTE	FTE	Adjusted FTE
Bachelor's or Less	1.40	0.65	0.91	1.00	0.78	0.78		0.87	0.00	8.20	0.91	7.46	2.13	0.91	1.94	12.73	11.09
Bachelor's + 15		0.70	0.00		0.83	0.00		0.87	0.00		0.96	0.00		1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Master's/Bachelor's + 45		0.74	0.00	4.31	0.87	3.75	4.06	0.91	3.69	1.13	1.00	1.13	24.16	1.04	25.13	33.66	33.70
Master's + 15		0.78	0.00		0.91	0.00		1.00	0.00		1.13	0.00		1.17	0.00	0.00	0.00
Master's + 45/Post-Masters		0.87	0.00		1.00	0.00		1.13	0.00		1.22	0.00	11.60	1.30	15.08	11.60	15.08
Total	1.40		0.91	5.31		4.53	4.06		3.69	9.33		8.59	37.89		42.14	57.99	59.87
															Matrix Totals	57.99	59.87

GRAND TOTAL (ISQ-A + ISQ-B) 693.10 657.78
RAW INDEX OF STAFF QUALIFICATIONS 1.00